



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/990,876	11/23/2001	Robert Lafleur	10442-8"US" JA/lm	2200

7590 08/04/2003

OGILVY RENAULT
Suite 1600
1981 McGill College Avenue
Montreal, QC H3A 2Y3
CANADA

EXAMINER

LE, THANH TAM T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2839

DATE MAILED: 08/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/990,876

Applicant(s)

LAFLEUR, ROBERT

Examiner

Thanh-Tam T. Le

Art Unit

2839

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 May 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 16-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 8-12 and 19-21 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 17 and 18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4-7 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 01 July 2002 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 1 and 2 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 1, line 5 and claim 2, lines 2-3, "a vertical edge" should be changed to -- the vertical edge --.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-2 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tan et al. (5,772,453).

Tan et al., figures 4A and 4B, disclose a computer motherboard-mounted graphics card (100) having at least one I/O connector, the card comprising two footprints (holes 106 and 108) positioned one behind the other for accommodating two different output types. Wherein a closer one (108) of the two footprints from a vertical edge of the card is for USB connector (10) and a farther one (106) of the two footprints from the vertical edge of the card is for D-sub connector (70) (column 3, lines 6-8); and one right-angle, vertical edge, I/O connector (10) mounted with pins (28) in a selected one of the two footprints.

Art Unit: 2839

Tan et al. disclose the instant claimed invention as described above except for the closer one of the two footprints from the vertical edge of the card is for DVI connector and the farther one of the two footprints from the vertical edge of the card is for HD-15 connector.

Tan et al., figures 4A and 4B, disclose the mother board (100) having the closer one (108) of the two footprints from the vertical edge of the card is for USB connector (10) and the farther one (106) of the two footprints from the vertical edge of the card is for D-sub connector (70). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Tan et al.'s mother board with two footprints for DVI and HD-15 connectors, in order to connect more than one types of connectors.

Regarding claim 2, Tan et al., disclose the I/O connector is selectively connected to the farther one of the two footprints from the vertical edge of the computer card and has a correspondingly horizontally elongated body.

Regarding claims 17 and 18, the features in the method claims are identical to those in the apparatus claims. Therefore, the method of manufacturing motherboard-mounted computer graphic cards alone is not a patentable feature.

4. Claim 3 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tan et al. in view of Fabian et al. (5,080, 609).

Tan et al., figure 4A, disclose the I/O connector comprising a first pair of card mounting members (56) positioned vertically on each side of the pins. Tan et al. fail to disclose a third card-mounting member positioned closer to the vertical edge.

Fabian et al., figure 14, disclose a boardlock (14 which read on a third card mounting member). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Tan et al. to have the boardlock as taught by Fabian et al., in order to provide accurately mount between the card and the connector.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 8-12, 16 and 19-21 are allowed.
6. Claims 4-7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
7. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

None of the reference discloses the vertical edge has a lower cut-out for accommodating a double-high connector, the two footprints are positioned at an upper position of the card, and the father one of the two footprints is located at a horizontal distance from the vertical edge greater than the lower cutout, in combination with the other claimed elements of the embodiments recited.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 5/14/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On page 10, second paragraph of the response, Applicant argues " Tan et al. does not describe having one footprint for a DVI connector and one footprint for an HD-15 connector."

The Examiner agrees, but "a closer one of the two footprints from a vertical edge of the card is **for** DVI connector and a father one of the two footprints from the vertical edge of the card is **for** HD-15 connector" are not positively claimed elements. Those functional languages are not positively recited in the claim. Therefore, those features are not giving any patentable weight.

On page 10, second paragraph of the response, Applicant argues " Furthermore, Tan et al. does not describe placing the DVI connector closer to the vertical edge than the HD-15 connector".

The Examiner disagrees.

Tan et al., figure 4A, disclose the last hole of (108) is closer to the vertical edge than the last hole of (106). Therefore, the footprint (108) is closer to the vertical edge than the footprint (106).

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh-Tam T. Le whose telephone number is (703) 306-5711. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn Feild can be reached on (703) 308-2710. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7722 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2839

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1782.

TL.
July 24, 2003



LYNN FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800